

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In an Office Action mailed January 20, 2006 (the "Office Action"), the Examiner:

- A. Requested missing information on related applications;
- B. Requested a new abstract and a new title;
- C. Rejected claims 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. 101;
- D. Rejected claims 33-42 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph; and
- E. Rejected claims 1-42 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by the teachings of Microsoft Outlook.

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 37-50

The Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for his discussion of the following remarks in a telephone interview on April 6, 2006. In that interview, the Examiner agreed that the rejections of claims 37-42 based on 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. 102(b) would be withdrawn. In addition, the Examiner suggested that the word "simultaneously" be added to claim 37 to make clear that the plurality of reply mechanisms are provided at the same time (e.g., as shown for email thread 500 in Figure 5 with Reply links 515, 525, and 535). Claim 37 has been amended per the Examiner's suggestion.

### **REMARKS**

**A. Request for missing information on related applications**

The requested information is provided in the amendment to the specification on p. 2.

**B. Request for a new abstract and a new title**

A new abstract and a new title are provided in the amendment to the specification on p. 2.

**C. Rejection of claims 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. 101**

Claims 33-36 have been cancelled.

**D. Rejection of claims 33-42 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**

Claims 33-36 have been cancelled.

For claims 37-42, the Examiner requests the applicants to identify the support for each of the claims in the specification. Support for claims 37-42 is found in Figures 5, 6A, and 6B and in paragraphs [0053]-[0057].

Applicants believe that the scope of claims 37-42 is clear and this rejection should be withdrawn. If these claims remain unclear to the Examiner after reviewing Figures 5-6 and paragraphs [0053]-[0057] of the specification, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner state with more specificity what aspect(s) of these claims are unclear to the Examiner.

**E. Rejection of claims 1-42 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by the teachings of Microsoft Outlook.**

Claims 1-36 have been cancelled.

Applicants believe original claims 37-42 (and new claims 43-50) are not anticipated by Microsoft Outlook. Note that the discussion of Microsoft Outlook in the specification (i.e., paragraph [0011]) is describing limitations and problems in Microsoft Outlook that are eliminated by the present invention. This discussion is not admitting that Microsoft Outlook anticipates the present invention.

**F. New claims 43-50**

Claims 43-50 have been added. These new claims are fully supported by the specification.

**G. Information Disclosure Statement**

An additional Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions asserted by the examiner, the applicant does not necessarily acquiesce in other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.


### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, the rejections in the Office Action mailed January 20, 2006 are believed to be traversed, and Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be passed to allowance.

If the Examiner believes a discussion of the above would be useful, he is invited to call the Applicant's attorney, Dr. Robert Beyers, at (650) 843-7528.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 7, 2006

  
Robert B. Beyers, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 46,552

MORGAN LEWIS  
2 Palo Alto Square  
3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700  
Palo Alto, CA 94306